DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 587 SP 018 743

AUTHOR Sivage, Carol R.; And Others
TITLE Operationalizing Advocacy: An Analysis of Dean's Roles as Project Directors of Deans Grants.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 14, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; *Administrator Role; *Change Agents; *Change Strategies; Educational Change; Higher Education; Mainstreaming; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *Deans Grant Project

ABSTRACT

The Deans' Grants awards have required skills and behaviors not traditionally associated with the role of dean. A sample of ten deans acting as Deans Grant project directors was studied to determine their roles and functions and the specific behaviors perceived as supportive of change efforts. Through interviews with the deans and staff, it was found that the deans had three principal roles: (1) as a negotiator with internal and external factions; (2) as a persuader for direct and indirect participation; and (3) as a choreographer of change by achieving role clarity, providing social support, and by allocating resources. The intensity of support varied from the support lent by physical presence, to active and informed involvement, and to the planned integration of the project with the larger, permanent goals of the institution. The essential category of physical presence ("being there") was fulfilled by all the deans, but more intense involvement was not universal, since it was situationally dependent. The findings point to key behaviors and levels of involvement that deans can choose in building a successful strategy for change. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206587

OPERATIONALIZING ADVOCACY: AN ANALYSIS OF DEAN'S ROLES AS PROJECT DIRECTORS OF DEANS GRANTS

Carol R. Sivage
Richard I. Arends
Diane L. Reinhard

American Educational Research Association
April 14, 1981
Los Angeles, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Sivage

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 018 743

The present investigation concentrates on the role of the dean in schools and departments of education as they attempt to manage a federally-funded change project. Although the role of the dean has been studied in the larger context (Cyphert and Zimpher, 1977; Conant, 1967; Dejnozka, 1978), we aimed at narrowing our observations to a particular set of behaviors associated with a specific set of activities.

BACKGROUND

In 1975, the Education for Handicapped Children Act (P.L-142) became public law. The implications of this piece of legislation have been far reaching, mandating significant changes in the way public schools serve handicapped children, including: establishing structures where handicapped children will be educated in a least restrictive environment (e.g. regular classrooms instead of special classrooms, in many instances); and guaranteeing an educational program that is tailored to specific individualized needs of a particular handicapped child.

In anticipation of the legislation, and from an awarenesss of the new skills that would be required of teachers, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) offered schools and departments of education in colleges and universities small grant awards* to plan and develop teacher preparation programs. These Dean's Grants' which in 1978-79 were awarded to over 100 colleges and universities around the country had two major requirements:

1. The dean must serve as project director

2. The grant must stimulate changes in regular teacher preparation programs, so that all teachers would be prepared to meet the needs of handicapped students in regular classrooms.

Clearly, these grants, put deans in a critical role, that of advocate of curricular reform. The original grant announcement from Dr. Edward W. Martin (July 29, 1974) states the charge. It requests the dean's assistance "as a change agent" in the preparation of regular teachers to prepare them to meet the needs of handicapped children in an expanded mainstream.

This direct invitation piqued our interest for two reasons. We know from the literature on innovation and change in public schools that school administrators are central in facilitating change efforts. Fuller and Pomfret (1976), Berman and McLaughlin (1975), Emrick (1977), Miles (1978), and Runkel, Schmuck, Arends and Francisco (1979) have produced evidence that showed that without the principal's active support and endorse-

* The mean award was $40,000, in 1978-79.

ment, almost any effort by outside change agents, such as the federal government, would fail. However, this evidence did not exist in the literature on change in higher education, nor had the role of key administrators in promoting change in colleges and universities been carefully examined. Requiring the dean, the top administrator in schools and departments of education, to serve as director of a special project that proposed major curriculum change was expecting a set of behaviors not traditionally associated with the formal authority and status of that role. To examine this strategy, we sought information that would answer the following questions.

1. When deans of education are put into the role of Project Director, what do they do?

2. Which specific behaviors of deans are seen as supportive of change efforts? In other words, how do deans who are seen as advocates of change in higher education act?

METHODOLOGY

For this study, we adapted a methodology developed earlier in our attempt to examine the role of principals in relation to externally funded change projects (Reinhard, Arends, Kutz and Wyant, 1979, and Wyant, Reinhard and Arends, 1980). Information was collected from two basic sources--from documents (proposals, evaluation reports, etc.) and from structured interviews during on-site observations. We use the term mini-case studies to characterize our actual field work and later analysis, acknowledging the influence of Stake (1976, 1977, 1978), Denny (1979), Lofland (1971), and Guba (1978) on the conceptual and methodological frameworks we selected.

Site Selection

In 1979, over one hundred institutions of higher education had been awarded Deans Grants from BEH. From a list of these projects provided by the University of Minnesota's National Support System Project (a technical assistance network), we randomly selected a pool of fifteen sites from which the final sample of ten was chosen. The final sites equitably represented the categories of institution size and mission, geographical region and funding level of grant.

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to arrival, we sought permisssion from the dean to collect data at his[1] site and arranged for interviews through a contact person assigned by the dean. We requested interview time

[1]We will use masculine pronouns throughout this report because all of the deans in the sample were men.

with the dean, with the grant's project coordinator[2] and with six to ten faculty members. We asked the contact person to select some faculty members who were very knowledgeable and supportive of grant activities and some who were not so involved or were critical of activities.

Interviews were guided by a set of questions more thoroughly described in the complete monograph of this research (Sivage, Reinhard and Arends, 1980). Essentially, we attempted to obtain information from our respondents that would allow us to understand the dean's project in the context of its particular setting and to identify specific behaviors exhibited by deans as they attempted to direct and manage their projects. We sought this information from two perspectives--the perspective of the dean himself and the view of faculty members or staff. We also asked respondents to make judgments about the degree to which identified behaviors were helpful or unhelpful in accomplishing the goals and activities of the projects.

We spent two days at each site observing Deans' Grant Projects and interviewing personnel. Each interview lasted from forty-five minutes to two hours. The data we report and discuss in the next section comes from the ninety-two individuals (ten deans, nine project coordinators, and seventy-three faculty members) interviewed at the ten sites in the sample.

Each researcher was responsible for writing up field notes from the interview protocols at each site visited. We had designed a format for our case write-ups in order to simplify content analysis. After all the site visits had been completed, each researcher did a preliminary analysis the first three cases. The team met to compare the results of these independent analyses and establish inter-rater reliability. Thereafter, we analyzed our own remaining cases to compile general lists of behaviors. The resulting lists were combined and grouped to fit various conceptual frameworks which had emerged from our observations, and our review of literature on higher education change processes.

RESULTS

In this section we discuss the results of our analysis across the ten cases. We describe instances of real, observed behaviors of deans who support Dean's Grants, in an attempt to "operationalize the definition of advocacy in a higher education setting. We will attempt to categorize these behaviors into a systematic framework of activities that are seen as supportive of change,

---

[2] In the process of preparing for data collection, we found that most projects had a person assigned to coordinate activities. We found this person to be well informed about the project and the dean's relationship to it.

using literature from the fields of general administration, higher education, and change and innovation to provide the conceptual framework.

This section begins with a brief discussion of the concept of advocacy. Next we describe key roles of deans who are perceived as advocates. The next topic discusses another dimension of advocacy - categories of advocacy intensity, which also has three categories. The final section presents the advocacy roles and the intensity of involvement categories in a grid format to graphically display their interrelationships. The following outline is offered to add structure and clarity to the results section.

I. Advocacy: A definition

II. Roles of Advocates
  A. The Dean as Negotiator with Competing Factions
  B. The Dean as Persuader for Participation
  C. The Dean as Choreographer of Change

III. Categories of Advocacy Intensity
  A. Being There
  B. Active/Informed Involvement
  C. Integration with the Institutional Mission

IV. Summary: Toward an Operational Definition of Advocacy

I. ADVOCACY: A DEFINITION

The practice of awarding Dean's Grant directly to deans was planned specifically to build advoc cy, commitment and awareness on the part of the chief administrator of schools and colleges of education.

A dean active in early planning of the Dean's Grant movement describes the rationale when he says:

> Special educators had tried to change regular teacher training programs for years, but they had no luck. A dean could do it though. If Deans could be brought together for discussion forums, they could learn from each other how to change teacher education. The dean could be chief planner, and Dean's Grants could provide planning money. (Corrigan Interview, April 1980)

These early planners saw the power of this planning grant money as a device to legitimize a dean's participation in curricular reform, and as a means to develop a powerful administrative advocate for educating handicapped children in mainstreamed settings. Numerous change studies reinforce this notion, stressing administrative advocacy as an essential variable of successful change efforts. (Gross et. al. 1971, Hall, 1978,

Emrick 1975, Smith and Keith 1971, Berman and McLaughlin 1975, Reinhard and Arends 1979, Bryson 1979). However, none of these studies offer specific information on the activities of administrators who are perceived as advocates. This is the focus of the next section, to describe the roles that deans take, as they direct a Deans Grant. The description of these roles comes from a review of literature, as well as interviews and observations fromm the 10 sites we visited.

II. ADVOCACY ROLES

A. The Dean As Negotiator With Competing Factions

Theorists in higher education organizational structures have described decision making process in higher education. Cohen and March, for instance, portray universities as: "organized anarchies, characterized by problematic goals, unclear technology and fluid, voluntary participation" (p. 3). These characteristics complicate the processes of changes in organizational structure, faculty attitudes, and involvement that Dean's Grants propose to make. Norms of faculty autonomy in higher education present additional difficulties to change (Baldridge 1978, Dejnozka 1975, Mandelbaum 1980).

Interdepartmental cooperation and communication are key requirements of Dean's Grants, and yet these theorists, as well as our own observations, show communication to be a most difficult endeavor. Special educators and regular educators, in the sites we visited, reported a lack of communication and in some cases outright hostility between their departments. This lack of communication presents a significant difficulty for Dean's Grants which propose to prepare regular faculty and students with what have traditionally been special education techniques. This sort of change presupposes interdependence, communication between departments and a willingness on the part of faculty to change and learn new skills. The most problematic aspect of Dean's Grants is that they can easily become marginal organizations, not really "owned" by either special education or regular education. These "marginal and autonomous grants, described as "loosely coupled" by Weick (1976) quickly dissolve when funding ceases. The comprehensive changes in curriculum, knowledge and attitudes that these grants propose are not institutionalized, or integrated into the total organization without careful planning, persuasion, and negotiation among the competing forces within higher education settings. Interdependence and cooperation are essential for success, and the individual in the ideal position to plan, persuade and negotiate among these forces may be the Dean.

Internal Negotiations: The deans we spoke with often described their roles as mediator and negotiator between the often discordant views of special education and regular education. The political nature of higher education decision making described by Baldridge (1978, p. 19-20) typifies the

situations we observed. We heard over and over in our interviews of instances where the dean had negotiated with divergent groups on behalf of the Dean's Grant. Some of these instances occurred within the education unit, usually between special education and regular education. In several instances we heard of negotiations within the larger university. This role as negotiator is a key one for the deans we visited.

Seven of the ten sites we visited had special education departments. If the Dean's Grant was closely identified with the special educators at these sites, there was often resentment on the part of the regular education faculty. We heard at every site we visited that the dean's ownership and control of the grant was essential. Faculty members told us, as did the deans themselves, that in order to achieve grant objectives with the regular education faculty, it was better not to identify with any group too closely, particularly the special education department.

External Negotiations: All the deans we interviewed spoke of some common problems of higher education, particularly declining enrollments that caused budget and program cuts. Two of them described an active role with BEH funding negotiations - the sort of external negotiation that only the dean can do. Other deans made it clear that the Dean's Grant was a high priority within the department, as evidenced by high visibility and public relations at university administrative levels. These deans represented the grant capably on committee assignments across campus.

We heard reports of deans who were carrying the goals of the Dean's Grant to state level political and certification channels. These deans were supporting state standards for certification that would prepare all teachers to work with handicapped people - a marketable skill in the current job market. We heard that deans could manipulate the reward structure of the university on behalf of the grant by developing overload policies and cutting through red tape.

In summary, our observations and interviews confirm theories of higher education organizations and politics. We saw Dean's Grants caught in the middle of opposing views of education, with the potential of becoming a marginal, and hence dissolvable innovation. We interviewed deans who told us of their role as negotiator between divergent forces in an attempt to build ownership and integration of the grant into existing programs. It appears to us that deans, as project directors of Dean's Grants, are in a unique and powerful position to mediate conflicts of values within education units, and also to negotiate with essential external forces. How they do this is the subject of the next section.

B. The Dean As Persuader For Participation

The deans we visited and the faculty members we interviewed told us how their Dean's Grant was organized. At each of our ten sites, deans worked through coordinators and faculty advisory committees in order to achieve the goals of the grant. We found that deans often assured involvement and participation in grant activities through powers of persuasion, both direct and indirect. There is evidence in the literature to support this role of persuader, especially given the political nature of university decision making (Baldridge, 1971, Salancik and Pfeffer 1977, Conant, 1978). These writers describe a task for which deans are uniquely prepared. As chief administrators of Dean's Grants they can offer political astuteness and the "power of the office" to what might otherwise be a marginal and easily dissolved change effort. The examples of power and persuasiveness we observed seem to fit in three categories; direct persuasion, "power of the office" persuasion, and a third category--persuasion through others.

Direct Persuasion. We found a number of very direct ways in which deans tried to influence faculty members to participate in Dean's Grant activities. The particular methods are highly dependent on personal style and situational context, so that one particular method might be rated as highly successful with one dean in his particular situation, and as unsuccessful by another person in another place. Nevertheless, we have identified some particular sets of direct persuasive behaviors which are described below.

Deans who talk about the Dean's Grants, its goals, objectives and potential, make a convincing persuasive argument for participation. This direct verbal support is most important, we found, at the grant's start up stages. The deans we interviewed who made a point of active persuasion at beginning of the year faculty meeting were remembered as advocates by faculty and coordinators. This support usually took the forms of commitment to the goals and vision of the grant and of legitimizing project staff by identifying them with the Dean's Grant.

Memos, letters, handwritten notes, columns in the faculty newspaper - these were vehicles to provide direct written support to Dean's Grant activities. For instance, one dean wrote a regular column where he stressed long range goals for the college, and his vision of the future of teacher education. In his particular large university situation, and with his personal reputation as a scholar, this was a most successful technique to persuade faculty to inform themselves about grant activities. Other deans used their visibility as scholars to produce articles and presentations on Dean's Grants. This national visibility was a powerful device to involve faculty at the local level.

In another place we visited, the dean had a more informal style of leadership. He preferred hadwritten notes, attached to

Dean's Grant activities, handouts and articles. This method, in its particular institutional context, was perceived as supportive.

Yet another dean, who was faced with multiple pressures in his urban university, found formal letters a useful direct persuasive device. This busy dean sent letters of invitation to faculty to attend inservice workshops. Though less personal than a handwritten note, he reported that this technique fit his busy schedule and the formality of the faculty he worked with.

Indirect Persuasion: The "power of the dean's office" was a potent persuader for involvement. Faculty members in each of our ten sites described how the dean persuaded them to participate in the Dean's Grant. Besides the direct behaviors reported above, their descriptions usually include an undefinable entity, sometimes described as "clout," but usually subtle and not describable in specific behavioral terms. When deans advocate and support activities, faculty members know it. We were impressed by the pervasiveness of this knowledge even when the dean was relatively uninvolved and invisible to faculty members. At each of the sites we visited, faculty could tell us what and whom the dean favored, even when the dean preferred to work through associate deans and department chairs. This knowledge appears to be based on a series of actions which can be identified, but also on a set of more subtle, unidentifiable behaviors. The concept of "gestalt" seems to describe what we saw--all of the deans' behaviors, direct and subtle, fit together into a pattern which broadcasts a message of advocacy or nonadvocacy. A dean who broadcasts "advocacy" in favor of the Dean's Grant is a most subtle, but powerful persuader for faculty involvement.

Persuasion Through Others: Some of the deans we interviewed let others help with persuasion. At one site, an international special education conference was held on campus as part of the physical education department. This conference, which was accompanied by building remodeling to meet accessibility standards, convinced the education department of the scope and potential of the handicapped equity movement.

Another example has to do with bringing nationally known scholars to campus on behalf of the Dean's Grant. Faculty members were impressed with the power and prestige of these presentors, and with their commitment and support of the Dean's Grant. Deans who were demonstrably part of the "network" of Dean's Grant consultants and participants were persuasive factors in stimulating faculty participation at the local level.

We propose, as a result of our visits, that persuasion must be fine tuned to fit the dean's style of leadership and the particular university situation. We think that there is a very thin line between persuasion and overt direction, and the placement of this line depends on both leaderhsip style and

situation. The results of this research confirm what our literature search told us. Deans lead by persuasion, not authoritarian direction. Whether direct or indirect, this "moral suasion" as Kantor puts it (1975 p. 5), is an extremely powerful stimulus to change.

C. The Dean As Choreographer Of Change

Most change studies agree with the finding that "the process of introducing and implementing change in schools is far more difficult and complex than current views envision" (Hall, 1978). Change is viewed as a process, not an event by these studies. There is an extended period of gradual behavior change, often difficult and time consuming, associated with the change process (Hall, 1978, Reinhard and Arends, 1979, Sivage, 1979).

Dean's Grant planners have theorized that deans are in an excellent position to facilitate, or choreograph the change processes needed to reorganize teacher education programs. Our interviews identified activities of deans which clarify the choreographer of change role. For instance, deans can assess the receptivity and capacity of the faculty for change as no one else can. We heard about actions of deans that facilitated mutual adaptation between the grant and the faculty members who were affected by grant activities. We observed how deans can deal with predictable conflicts between divergent factions by careful choreograhy, coordinated planning and coaching. Additionally, we identified specific activities by which deans provide the structures and supports to facilitate the process of change, using the Dean's Grant to provide personnel and financial resources.

Achieving Role Clarity. Most of the deans we visited left day-to-day operations of the grant to others, usually project coordinators and/or management teams. Communication and brainstorming are essential to achieve clarity of roles, the who-does-what, day-to-day management of the project. We heard time and time again that teams made up of dean and coordinator must clearly define their individual roles regarding management of the grant, and we observed a great variety in how these roles were defined. Individual personalities, academic status, and the context of the situation were determining factors in role definition.

We observed that in cases where the coordinator of the grant was a low status faculty member or a graduate student, it was important for the dean to coach and visibly and actively communicate project goals and activities. Careful role definition and highly visible communication between the dean and coordinator were especially important to legitimize Grant activities in these cases.

Several of our sites were managed by relatively high status faculty members, an associate dean in one case, full professors

with many publishing credits in others. In these grants, the dean provided a slightly different sort of support, easing the way for project goals and keeping communication channels open. Coordinators in these projects, perhaps appropriately because of their experience, took a more active role in conceptualizing the goals of the grant. In some cases these coordinators were the primary planner, with the dean providing mainly consultative functions. We could summarize the issue of role clarity by speculating that it is not so important who does the job. What seems to count is clear communication and the dean's visible support for what gets done.

Providing Social Support. We discovered that in Dean's Grants, as anywhere else, hard work deserves recognition. Specifically, deans who took the time to compliment hard working coordinators, to thank faculty for extra efforts on behalf of the grant, and to express confidence and social support for difficult change efforts were highly appreciated. This social support from the dean builds trust. Coordinators and faculty members told us they have confidence and can be more assertive in achieving grant goals when they know the dean "supports" them.

Using and Allocating Resources. Through Dean's Grant funding is usually relatively low compared to other grant awards, we have observed that it is more important to consider relative funding compared to other available discretionary monies. In other words, if the dean has $40,000 (the mean grant award), and it can all be used for faculty retreats, inservice sessions and other reward systems, then he has a comparitively powerful resource to stimulate curriculum change. The coordinator and project staff of the grant, if carefully chosen, provide another excellent resource in terms of technical assistance and support to faculty. The point is important enough to repeat. Deans control a powerful reward system through Dean's Grant funds. Though the grant award is usually not large, it provides a relatively large addition to the discretionary monies the dean has available. In most of our sites these discretionary funds were a scarce resource indeed.

We heard of numerous instances where Dean's Grant funds were used to persuade and reward faculty participation. Released time for faculty members to work on grant objectives was a common device, as was faculty grants to stimulate curriculum module development. At one of our sites, the dean administered a mini-grant competition for faculty who wished to research educational techniques for the handicapped. Other projects chose faculty retreats as a staff development technique.

Our experience tells us of the crucial role that project coordinators play. In virtually all the sites we visited, if the grant was too closely associated with the special education department, problems developed. Coordinators who most successfully bridged the gap between department provided a careful mix of credibility and understanding of both regular and special

education. We observed this dual credibility with regular and special education faculties to be absolutely essential, as was a spirit of cooperation and helpfulness on the coordinator's part. The personality and style of the coordinator must be carefully meshed with the context of the situation, and the dean is in the perfect position to choreograph the match.

In review, we observed that Dean's Grants can provide vital and scarce resources to deans as they reorganize teacher training programs. These resources occur in the form of discretionary funds to stimulate change activities, and in the form of additional personnel to facilitate those activities. The key figure in this strategy is the dean, who serves as choreographer - choosing, directing and overseeing an appropriate case of characters to fit the situation he directs.

III. Categories of Advocacy Intensity

A second dimension of advocacy has to do with what we call intensity of involvement. These intensities of involvement are often related to personal leadership style and situational context as deans administer the goals and objectives of Dean's Grants. The first category, Being There, is crucial if a dean is to be perceived as an advocate. The other categories, Active/Informed Involvement and Integration With Institutional Mission are more rare, and more situationally dependent.

A. Being There

At each of our ten sites we heard the same thing. The dean must support the Dean's Grant. When we tried to find out what this support meant, we discovered that in many cases our respondents were referring to "Being There," a sort of ceremonial involvment characterized by the dean's bodily presence at seminars, lectures and meetings, or to the dean's signature 'being there" on Dean's Grant memos and letters. We visited a cross section of Dean's Grants, in large, small, research and teacher training institutions, and in all of these places we heard the same thing - physical presence means advocacy.

Almost every dean we visited stressed the importance of attending Dean's Grant activities. In some cases apparently, simple physical presence is enough, but this presence is essential for advocacy. Our respondents reported "looking for the dean" at Dean's Grant activities. The fact that these busy administrators find time to attend these events is perceived as supportive by most faculty we interviewed. We speculate that the amount of support of this bodily presence has to do with the relative isolation of the dean from faculty activities. Thus, at one institution, simple bodily presence connoted a great deal of support, since the university was large and the dean was usually perceived as uninvolved with faculty matters. In another case the dean could say, while looking at his calendar "There's no way I can get out of this Dean's Grant activity - I must support the

grant," and this negative sounding statement was perceived as supportive by onlockers who know of this particular dean's over-booked schedule.

At other universities we spoke with deans who attended planning sessions as observers and listeners. This seemed to facilitate and support the planning, especially when several departments were involved. In higher education settings, time is a valued resource, and how the dean allocates his time is symbolic of support. This fact is understood, we found, across departmental levels, and even passive attendance is important.

A second aspect of "Being There" has to do with the dean's signature. In most of our visits, faculty and the deans themselves stressed the importance of having communications come from the dean's office, with the dean's signature displayed in a prominent place. This appeared to be especially important on requests for additional faculty participation in inservice and other staff development activities. The memo or meeting notice is usually written by someone else, often the project coordinator, but we found that the dean's letterhead, and the dean's signature must "be there."

B. Active/Informed Involvement

We heard many reports of active and informed involvement of deans with these grants, where deans not only attended meetings and inservice sessions, but played an active and informed role, introducing speakers, giving presentations, and demonstrating a knowledge and conceptual understanding of Dean's Grant purposes. In several cases the dean and project coordinator interacted at meetings and planning sessions in a way that showed mutual participation and decision making. This was observed as supportive of both the grant and the person in the coordinator position. Our respondents told us that knowledgeable deans, who understood the grant and took an active and informed role, were seen as strong advocates. Their involvement is demonstrated in a number of specific ways, for instance:

- One dean volunteers information about the Deans Grant and its activities with colleagues in the hallway, on car trips to conferences, and in other informal settings.
- Several deans we spoke with were active in coordinating Deans Grant conferences and retreats, inviting and entertaining the speakers and participants.
- One dean writes about the Dean's Grant in his quarterly report to local schools and volunteers to talk to superintendents and teachers about the grant.
- Two other deans have written nationally published articles on Dean's Grant activities, and another one provides regular Dean's Columns in a bimonthl newsletter.

- o Several deans we observed took unusually active roles in conceptualizing the goals of the grant. In these universities, this active attention to curriculum change was observed as strong commitment.
- o One dean showed his commitment to Dean's Grants by learning the technical language of special education, becoming a recognized advocate of the handicapped at state levels.

In several of our visits we heard of deans who were especially active in planning grant activities, chairing meetings, approving agendas and the like. Activity level seems to be a relative variable. Faculty members, coordinators and deans alike tended to compare Dean's Grant activity with the dean's general involvement in other things. Obviously situational context and leadership style play a large part in these ratings, but generally a high level of relative activity in Dean's Grants, compared to activity in other things, was observed to be a very supportive behavior.

C. Integration With The Institutional Mission

Most of the deans we studied were reported to be visible, some were actively involved, and a few reported a goal of institutionalization, or integration with the institutional mission. These deans expressed commitment to the larger goals, the concept and vision of the education unit and the university. They told us they viewed the Dean's Grant as a vehicle to achieve that larger goal, and they intended their grant to be integrated into the total program - a primary criterion of institutionalization.

These deans reported inherent value in the vision of the Dean's Grant. They made speeches that stressed the integration of the grant into the total education program. These deans responded to other external forces for change, such as certifying agencies and state and federal legislation, and they stressed the role of the Dean's Grant to help make the mandated changes. Their comments to faculty stressed the importance of change to fit the mandates of the laws, and they stressed the importance of involvement by everyone.

SUMMARY

IV. Toward An Operational Definition Of Advocacy

We propose, as a result of this research, that advocacy can be examined on two dimensions, the first dimension describing roles that advocates take, and the second dimension providing information about intensity of advocates involvement. These dimensions do not seem to be mutually exclusive. Rather they overlap and intersect each other as the following grid illustrates. Examples from our site visits are used to help clarify the grid categories.

The Two Dimensions of Advocacy

ADVOCACY ROLES	ADVOCACY INTENSITIES		
	Being There	Active Informed Involvement	Integration with Institutional Mission
Negotiator Role	Dean as Project Director - signing the grant.	Calling BEH to negotiate funding.	Developing alternative funding sources to keep grant goals going when funding ceases.
	Dean's Grant clearly operates from dean's office. Physical location of coordinator's office.	"Legitimizing" the coordinator as mouthpiece of the dean, rather than of special education at faculty presentations.	Dean's Grant activities integrated with other activities, joint and cooperative seminars.
Persuader Role	Dean's physical presence at seminars, retreats and Dean's Grant activities.	Making a Dean's Grant presentation at faculty meeting or larger university meeting.	Presentations stress common purpose of Dean's Grant and institutional goal.
	Countersigning memos.	Writing supportive memos.	Scholarly writing; "Dean's Column in newsletter.
	Dean attends national Dean's Grant Conference.	Dean takes active part in national role, is visibly part of Dean's Grant Network bringing in speakers, etc.	Dean is active in statewide efforts at teacher education reform. Dean becomes recognized advocate for the handicapped.
Choreographer of Change Role	Role clarity - clear expectations of who does what.	Active participation in planning - volunteering services - actually writing a learning module, or participating in video-taping.	Striving for integration with larger goals at administrative council meetings.
	Most involved in start-up stage - then delegation.	Active involvement in ongoing planning.	Grant resources used for larger goals - secretarial module development - reorganization.
			Suggesting changes in seminar format to better integrate with existing schedule.

The advocacy roles of deans provide one dimension of the framework. We observed deans who negotiated with competing environmental factions, both internal and external. We described deans who persuaded faculty to become involved in Dean's Grant activities, using personal persuasion, "power of the office" persuasion, and even allowing others to persuade for them. Finallly we observed deans who successfully choreographed change, coaching, directing and overseeing an appropriate cast of characters to fit the situation. Though these roles as Negotiator, Persuader, and Choreographer of Change are represented in the literature we reviewed, and supported by our data, they are clearly not the only roles that deans take. However, for the purposes of this study, which examines the role of deans as project director of Dean's Grants, they are appropriate, and provide one dimension of an operational definition of advocacy.

The second proposed dimension, describes intensity of involvement. The first and most essential category is Being There, which is a ceremonial sort of presence, either in the form of bodily presence at Dean's grant activities, or in the form of the dean's signature and letterhead on written communiques. While this sort of advocacy is relatively uninvolved, we believe it is absolutely essential for deans to "be there" if they are to be perceived as advocates.

Some deans took an active and informed role with grant activities. The second intensity, Active/Informed Involvement includes behaviors like learning a new technical language of special education, volunteering for duties, and volunteering supportive comments about grant activities.

A few deans took an integrated view of project activities. This level, Integration With Institutional Mission, goes beyond support of the relatively narrow scope of project activities. At this stage, deans report a great valuing of the central concept of Dean's Grants - reorganization of teacher education to better meet the needs of all children. They express a desire to use the grant as a vehicle to achieve this larger goal. In other words, they both advocate and intend to integrate the central concept of the grant into the larger institutional mission, so that its central concept remains intact when funding is finished. This, in our view, is the highest intensity of advocacy behavior.

DISCUSSION

This study provides the first steps toward describing how deans support curriculum change in higher education. It also illustrates striking similarities in behaviors of deans across and within institutions and has raised some important questions for future research.

At each site, deans and faculty members were cooperative, facilitative to our investigation, and willing to share

information with us quite openly. Within sites, reports from all respondents were amazingly consistent in their characterization of the dean's behavior in relation to the project. The ten deans were significantly more involved with the Dean's Grant than with other grants and contracts in their institutions, and all deans appeared to have the confidence of their faculty. Across sites, faculty members seemed to place high value on knowing what the dean thought of people, issues, and activities in the college; the individuals we interviewed also seemed to have that information.

The characteristics we have described would generally be considered positive and desirable. The perceived well-being of a project may make a difference in the way people view and report the dean's role. Is the dean an important contributor to the failure of a project? Are the dean's behaviors different in such cases? Do faculty members know less about and have less confidence in a dean when the Dean's Grant project is going badly?

We also found that the ten deans did not usually participate directly in conceptualization and development of curriculum change; those activities remained primarily the province of faculty. Instead, our findings suggest that the necessary supportive behaviors were ordinary and familiar; bringing together the right group of people, providing released time and other support mechanisms for project activities, and, in general, creating an optimal environment for the work to be done.

We asked people to describe behavior: what did the dean do that helped the project. Our findings suggest that the necessary supportive behaviors may, in fact, have a subtle, nonverbal worth. For example, we learned that project members valued easy access to the dean, and we learned that faculty members valued having the dean attend project meetings and activities. We do not know what made such access valuable, what messages were conveyed by proximity, or how gestures of closeness are interpreted as furthering project efforts.

The scope of our study does not provide information about the quality of the curriculum emerging from projects using the dean as principal investigator, nor does it define the nature of the dean's effect on those outcomes. Exploring the inferred meaning of the dean's behavior and its relationship to outcomes is, therefore, a relevant direction for future research. If administration is only loosely coupled to instructional activities as some theorists have described (for example Weick, 1976; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; and March, 1978), we wonder if involving the top administrator produces any real change in curriculum and instruction. Does it merely present the illusion of success in that a set of special activities associated with a project have been successfully carried to completion, while school goes on as usual?

At the same time, the evidence collected in this study points to key behaviors that deans perform to support curriculum change. Knowing these specific behaviors that are perceived as helpful can be useful to the funding agencies that choose to use the strategy employed by BEH. Deans who decide to put their energy behind a particular project or reform effort, may find this study useful in planning a support strategy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldridge, J.V. Policy Making and Effective Leadership, National Study of Academic Mangement, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1978.

Baldridge, J.V. Power and Conflict in the University Research in the Sociology Of Complex Organizations, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1970

Berman,P. Greenwood, P.W., McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, The Findings In Review Vol IV Santa Monica, Rand Corporation, 1975.

Berman, P, McLaughlin,M.W. Federal Programs Supporting EducationalChange, Vol V Santa Monica, Rand Corporation, 1975

Bryson, John, and Kelley, G. A Political Perspective on Leadership: Emergence Stability and Change in Organizational Networks

Bryson, John and Delbecq, A.L. A Contingent Approachto Strategy and Tactics In Project Planning APA Journal, April 1979.

Cohen, M.D. March J.G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President McGraw Hill, 1974.

Conant, M.B. The Academic Dean As Subversive Bureaucrat. Educational Record 1967, 48, 3 , 276-284

Dejnozka, E. The Dean of Education: A study of Selected Role Norms, Journal Of Teacher Education 1978, 24,5, 81-84.

Emrick, J.A. Peterson, S.M, and Agarwala-Rogers, R. Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network. Menlo Park, California, Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

Fullan, M. Pomfret, A. Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47, 335 -97.

Geertz, C. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York, Basic Books Inc., Harper, 1973.

Guba, E. Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation Los Angeles: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Evaluation UCLA, 1978

Gould, J.W. Academic Deanship , New York, Institute of Higher Education, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964

Gross, N. Giaquinta,J, Bernstein,M. Implementing Organizational Innovations, New York , Basic Books, 1971

Hall, G. Loucks, S., George, A., An Exploratory Study of Implementation of Deans Grant Projects in the Southwest, CBAM Project, University of Texas at Austin, December 1978.

Kanter, RM. Wheatley,MJ, Career Development for Women in Academic Administration The Role of Training, Summary of a report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Kritek, W , Lessons from the Literature of Implementation, Educational Administration Quarterly, 1976, 12, 3, 86-102.

Mandelbaum, The Intelligence of Universities, Journal of Higher Education , 1979, 50, 697-725.

Reinhard,D., Arends, R., A Study of the Principals Role in Externally Funded Change Projects and the Implications for Inservice Training, University of Oregon Teacher Corps Project, July, 1979.

Salancik,G,. Pfeffer, J. The Bases and Uses of Power in Organizatonal Decision Making: The Case of a University. Administrative Science Quarterly , 1974.

Sivage, C,. Implementing a Mandate: Public Law 94 142 In the Schools, Doctoral Dissertation, 1979.

Sivage, C,. Damming the Mainstream: Barriers to the Implementation of an Innovation Oregon Schools Study Council Bulletin, April 1979, Eugene Oregon

Sivage, Carol, Reinhard, Diane, and Arends, Richard, Operationalizing Advocacy An Analysis of Dean's Roles asProject Directors of Dean's Grants, 1980, unpublished

Smith, L.M., and Keith, P.M. Anatomy or Educational Innovations, New York Wiley and Sons, 1971

Weick, K.E. Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly , 1976, 21, 1-19.